
From: Robert A. Mancini /clake,wec
To: =SMTP:ATHERTJ@bp.com
CC: =SMTP:hoghms@bp.com; =SMTP:considim@bp.com;
=SMTP:Proctor2@bp.com; =SMTP:SAUERDC@bp.com; Jeff G.
Handwerk /denver,refineslc; Stanley W. Sorrels /whiting,refinewhi;
George W. Stroh /denver,refineman; Lee L. Valentine /texascity,refinetxc;
=SMTP:AkinA@bp.com; =SMTP:CrepauA@bp.com;
=SMTP:DeBruyBP@az1.bp.com; =SMTP:WESTWOOCR@bp.com; Dale
K. Crumpler /chicago,refineykt; Ron L. Cutshall /chicago,refinechi; Mark
S. Erickson /denver,refineman; =SMTP:GarciaFJ@bp.com;
=SMTP:WittenH@mobil-europe-lubes.com; =SMTP:hamilti@bp.com;
=SMTP:regnerjf@mobil-europe-lubes.com;
joe_r_natale@email.mobil.com; StapleJK@bp.com; Bill E. Lash
/whiting,refinewhi; Robert A. Mancini /clake,wec;
=SMTP:VoorenAB@bp.com; =SMTP:DanePB@az1.bp.com;
=SMTP:BellegPY@mobil-europe-lubes.com; Bill H. Ralph
/texascity,refinetxc; =SMTP:phillirs1@bp.com; =SMTP:FasqueS@mobil-
europe-lubes.com; =SMTP:TANGTH@sesrcx1.src.se.bp.com;
=SMTP:Ulrich.Blanke@bayernoil.de; =SMTP:WolfBW@bp.com;
=SMTP:HoogerWN@bp.com; =SMTP:DowneyWM@bp.com

BCC:

Sent Date: 1999-03-04 20:45:00:000
Received 1999-03-04 20:45:00:000
Date:

Subject: Re: RISK MANAGEMENT AND ASSESSMENT

Attachments:

We have conducted some training in the past and have conducted a number of risk based studies (or have assisted other in doing so). As a follow on to Amoco's efforts late last year to issue a protocol for instrumented safety systems, as well as the increasing need for tools to address process safety recommendations, our intent was to develop a training package this year. Clearly, there is no need for us to start from scratch on this, and I would endorse the application of the training you have in hand. There may, however, be a number of areas that should be addressed or at least identified before we present the course.

1. RISK ACCEPTANCE Whether we call these "acceptance" criteria, benchmarks, targets, or use some other designation, the fact is that Amoco and BP developed and used somewhat different criteria. Amoco's criteria were formally included in facility siting protocols, and other initiatives were built on the same benchmarks. Also, Amoco developed a population risk criterion for on-site risks, something that, I understand, BP did not elect to do.

2. RISK MATRIX There are differences here, as well. An approach that

lumps all fatality related consequences (single, multiple, off site, on site) into one category has tended to present difficulties when teams have attempted to implement a matrix type approach. Also, the Amoco matrix, and guidelines for its use, were designed to be consistent with the risk criterion.

3. Safety Instrumented Systems Here again, the two former companies recently developed different protocols, though I have not compared the output from the two methodologies to determine whether they produce substantially different results. Amoco's was based on ISA S84 whereas BP's was based on the IEC standard.

4. "COST" OF A HUMAN LIFE BP embraced the principle that these costs can be specified for the purposes of cost benefit analysis. Amoco was generally unwilling to take this step. This is more a cultural issue than a technical one, but one that will have to be addressed.

I don't think any of these issues, as well as others that may be out there, are unresolvable. I do think, however, that we should try to anticipate as many of these as we can before presenting the training. If they remain temporarily unresolved, I would suggest the training incorporate, or at least mention, the alternatives. I feel that the approach to these matters used in the training should not constitute a "de facto" resolution simply because the training exists and is ready to be presented. They should be resolved in a manner in which the pros and cons can be weighed and discussed. Incidentally, this is not a matter of who "win" and who "loses"; but rather is a question of arriving at the best approach for BP-Amoco.

If possible, I would like to receive a copy of the training materials as far in advance of the class date as possible. I could then review the information and identify areas where technical or cultural issues are most likely to arise. Also, I would be happy to assist in the presentation of the course.

Reply Separator

Subject: RISK MANAGEMENT AND ASSESSMENT
Author: ATHERTJ (ATHERTJ@bp.com) at unix,mime
Date: 3/4/99 10:29 AM

During a visit to Whiting Refinery in January the issue of the differences in how BP and Amoco have addressed risk management in the past was raised, and that early consideration should be given to understanding where each other has come from. I suggested that we use the Sunbury based HSE Shared Service for this, as there was no equivalent organisation within Amoco, and use their QRA (quantified risk assessment) training material to facilitate this process. They have two presentations available: a 2 day training session, including syndicate exercises, for the process safety practitioners which deals with the subject in depth, and a one day overview for managers. I would suggest that we hold both session in the US in May, the week

commencing 3rd May being the most attractive from the UK side (I understand that there are API meetings the week before). The team of Mike Hogh and Mike Considine has presented this material many times before to a whole range of people from process safety professionals to senior managers at Board level. They also participated in the Cullen (UK judicial) enquiry into the Piper Alpha disaster.

After talking to a number of people, the suggestion is to hold the 2 day QRA training course first in order to get the practitioners to understand technically how the BP approach works. As part of this session we would identify areas where there are concerns in the ex-Amoco camp on how these techniques may be applied at their locations. Immediately following the 2 day session we would hold a one day overview primarily for RPSC Chairs, but would involve other senior managers if they are available, at which time we could explore the concerns of the practitioners and establish the way forward in adopting this technology. At this point I would also seek the participation of the ex-BP sites to make their input from a US perspective as we have been using these techniques at Toledo and Alliance for many years.

Grateful for your support on this proposal. Please let me know if you can participate at both the practitioner and RPSC level. I would also be grateful for any offers to host the sessions and one of the sites?

Look forward to hearing from you.